#### REMARKS

#### I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated December 1, 2004, claims 1-44 have been cancelled, and new claims 45-60 have been added. Claims 45-60 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

# II. Claim Amendments

The Applicants have canceled claims 1-44 and present new claims 45-60.

# III. The Cited References and the Subject Invention

## A. The Eyer Reference

U.S. Patent No. 6,401,242, issued June 4, 2002 to Eyer et al. disclose a method and apparatus for designating a preferred source to avoid duplicative programming services. Interactive Program Guide (IPG) data for television is delivered to integrated receiver-decoders (IRDs) in a decoder population via, for example, a satellite network. The IPG data provides scheduling information for global and local programming services which are carried via the satellite network as well as another network such as a CATV network or a terrestrial broadcast network. Each IRD is assigned to an IPG region using unit addressing. At the IRD, IPG data is filtered so that only the global data and the region-specific data for the IRD's IPG region is retained and processed by the IRD. Channel map data is also delivered to the IRDs so that bundles of IRD data can be filtered out using firmware filtering to discard program sources that are not present in the channel map. The IRD data which is retained after filtering is used to provide scheduling information via an on-screen display. A preferred source may be designated when there are duplicative channels on the different networks.

## IV. Office Action Prior Art Rejections

In paragraphs (1)-(2), the Office Action rejected claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated over Eyer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,401,242 (Eyer). These rejections are most in light of the amendments presented herein.

Claim 45 is directed to an embodiment of the invention that includes legacy and non-legacy networks broadcasting signals to legacy and non-legacy receivers. FIG. 7 provides both support and a visual reference for this claim:

•		712	A 7128	3 7120	712	D
	702	704	706	708	710	
712	SCID	Network 0	Notwork 1 (Enhanced 1)	Notwork 2 (Enhanced 2)	(Enhanced 3)	
7	•	Legacy MPG	Legacy MPG	Legacy MPG	Legacy MPG	
-	2	ÇĂP	CAP	CAP	CAP	
	3	PIP	PIP	PIP	PIP	ł .
714	4-	Legacy MPG's DiP	Legacy MPG's DIP	Legacy MPG's DIP	Logacy MPG's DIP	
<b>₩</b>	6	SPG	SPG	SPG	SPG	
	- 6		-			Į.
						1
750	7_	Tailored and		Tallored and	tationed and	
N.	_ 8	Market MPGs		Market MPGs'	Market MPGs	754
716	-	MBIKBI MPGS		DIP	OIP	1/94
- (-)				Unified MPG	Unified MPG	$\boldsymbol{\nu}$
$\neg$	9	Tajlored MPG	_	(Network 2 &3)	(Network 2 & 3)	1
1				1—————————————————————————————————————	videp/	7
	10	videa/	Video	video/ audio/	augio/	1
		อนต์ใด/	ADMIC		data	1
718	0×4FF	data	data	d <sub>2</sub> /S	199.65	1
1	0×500	BARPI			-	]
7		announce	- 1100000	WINK	WINK	T 752
720	0x501	WINK	MINK			170
750	0x502		-/	Poroign MPG	Foreign MPG (Taltited	$\boldsymbol{\nu}$
_		ļ		iTalined MPG from	MPG tram	
	1			Molivore 0)	Natwork (2)	J.
	<del></del>		72	1181		7
722	0x504		<b>_</b>		<del></del>	7
/	0x505	Foreign MPG (Unified MPG kom Networks	-	_	_	ļ
_	<b>,</b>	2 2 3)			<del></del>	4
758	0x506		-			<b></b>
730	0x507				T	
		<del>                                     </del>				
724	0×608	<del></del>	<del></del>		<del>-</del> _	
7,57	L DYSON	Marker 1	Market 1	Market 1	Market 1	7
•	OX50A	MPG	MPG _	MPG	MPG	_
	2.500	Market 2	Market 2	Market 2	Market 2	11
	0x50B	MPG	MPG	MPG	MPG	11
	0x522		1			11
	DXDZZ	Market 25	Market 25	Market 25	Market 25	726
		MPG	MPG	MPG	MPG	11
	1	, MrG	WIFE	l		<b>⊿</b> \
		<del> </del>		T		<b>」</b>
	0.000	<del> </del>	<del>                                     </del>	<del></del>		_i
	0x808	SPG	SPG	SPG	SPG _	コノ
	TARL	1 304				•

FIG. 7

So far as the Applicants can ascertain, the Eyer reference does not disclose or suggest the notion of a legacy network transmitting first program guide information describing a first set of programs to legacy receivers on a first service channel, and to non-legacy receivers on a second service channel, and transmitting second program guide information describing a second set of

programs to non-legacy receivers on a third channel of the plurality of service channels. The Applicants therefore submit that claim 45 is patentable over the references of record. Claims 51 and 55 are patentable for the same reasons.

## V. <u>Dependent Claims</u>

Dependent claims 46-50, 52-54 and 56-60 incorporate the limitations of their related independent claims, and are therefore patentable on this basis. In addition, these claims recite novel elements even more remote from the cited references. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that these claims be allowed as well.

### VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Georgann S. Grunebach, Registration No. 33,179

Attorney for Applicants

Date: February 25, 2005

The DIRECTV Group, Inc. RE / R11 / A109 P.O. Box 956 2250 E. Imperial Highway El Segundo, CA 90245-0956

Phone: (310) 964-4615